

### REMARKS

Applicant's representative expresses appreciation for the interview conducted on January 7. The amendments made by this response and the remarks are consistent with that which was discussed during the interview.

The Final Office Action, mailed October 27, 2008, considered claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31-39, 42, 43 and 45. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10-16, 18-22, 24, 27-28, 31-37, 39, 42, 43 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Desai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,820,204). Claims 4, 17, 25 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Desai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,820,204), in view of Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,581,059 B1).

By this response, claims 1, 15, 22, and 36 are amended while claims 4, 11, 12, 17, 19, 21, 25, 32, 33, 38, and 39 are canceled. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13-16, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28, 31, 34-37, 42, 43, and 45 remain pending of which claims 1, 15, 22, and 36 are independent.

#### Overview of the Invention

The present invention is directed to embodiments for controlling how applications that run on a computer access contact information that is stored on the computer. The independent claims have been amended to clarify this aspect. The amendments also specify that the contact information corresponds to the user that is logged on to the computer when the request for contact information is made. In this manner, the user may allow or deny an application from accessing the contact information corresponding to that user. The amendments further specify that the user is informed of the application's intended use of the contact information so that the user may make an educated decision whether to allow or deny access.

#### Consideration of the IDSs

In the previous office action, the examiner indicated that he did not consider the references cited in the IDSs filed on 7/13/07, 8/24/07, and 10/22/07 because of the large number of references cited. The examiner has requested that Applicant indicate which references are most relevant and which are not material. However, Applicant does not believe any particular reference is more relevant than another, or that any reference is not material. These references have been cited to exercise an abundance of caution to ensure that Applicant has complied with its duty of disclosure under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56. The majority of these references were cited in office actions received in co-pending

applications that Applicant has determined may be somewhat related to the present application. For this reason, Applicant believes that all of the cited references could be deemed material to the patentability of the present claims.

#### Prior Art Rejections

Although both Desai and Barrett disclose embodiments relating to controlling access to contact information, these references fail to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims. Both of these references disclose databases storing contact info that are accessed online and don't provide the real-time access control of the present invention.

Desai, for example, discloses an "information exchange system [that] is connected to one or more registered users through a communications network, such as the Internet..." *See* Col. 3, lines 45-47. To allow a third party to access the contact information, the registered user must access the system and specifically select "one or more third party users to which access to the selected data element is to be granted." *See* Col. 5, lines 40-44. In other words, Desai requires a user to provide "pre-approval" to a third party. Further this third party is not an application that runs on the computer which stores the info. In contrast, the present invention allows a user to allow or deny access in real-time to an application that is running on the computer. This is possible because the concurrently logged on user's contact information is presented to the user to allow the user to allow or deny access, or to provide alternate information to the application. The user is able to make an educated decision because he is informed in real-time as to the intended use of the information. Desai does not provide any of these benefits because the user must allow access before a request for access is ever made.

Barrett is similar to Desai. For example, Barrett discloses an information server that functions similar to the information exchange system of Desai. The information server stores contact information as well as "information preferences [which] define an entity's preferences regarding the conditions of use under which the personal information will be released." *See* Col. 3, lines 31-42. When a third party requests information, the third party specifies its intended use which is compared to the stored preferences to determine whether to grant access to the information. *See* Col. 3, lines 46-51. Therefore, like Desai, the user must specify whether to allow or deny access before the request for access is made. Additionally, although preferences are specified, this is all done prior to the request

for access being made. Therefore, Barrett does not provide the same control to the user to determine whether an application may access the information.

Therefore, the combination of Desai and Barrett fails to teach or suggest: "detecting a request from an application that is running on the computer for contact information corresponding to a particular user that is logged on to the computer;" "after detecting the request and prior to providing the application with the requested contact information, informing the user that the application is seeking certain contact information by presenting to the user a list of a plurality of selectable contact personas that are each associated with the user and that each contain different contact information about the user, and presenting to the user a privacy value proposition to inform the user how the application will use the contact information;"<sup>1</sup> or "receiving a user selection of a contact persona from the list of the plurality of contact personas."<sup>2</sup>

Finally, it is further noted that the online systems of Desai and Barrett do not provide the benefits of allowing the application to receive contact information for the currently logged on user of the computer. This is significant in that an application running on the computer will usually want the contact information corresponding to the user who has invoked the application. For example, if a user logs into a computer and starts an email application to send an email, the email application can request the appropriate email address to include in the from field (such as a work email, personal email, etc.). The present invention provides a way to shield the email application from having direct access to possibly sensitive contact information while still being able to receive the requested information from the user with limited interaction from the user. Because the invention selects the contact personas that correspond to the logged on user, the contact personas that correspond to the user are presented to the user for selection. The cited art does not provide any of these advantages because they don't provide real-time access control for an application that runs on the same computer on which the user is logged on.

---

<sup>1</sup> In both references, the user must specify who can access the contact information before the third party requests the contact information. Therefore, both references fail to teach "after detecting the request and prior to providing the application with the requested contact information...."

<sup>2</sup> In both references, access rights are determined beforehand based on user specified input. The user cannot select in real-time whether a third party can access the contact information. Therefore, neither reference teaches that the user's selection of a persona grants the application access to the contact persona.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the rejections to the independent claims are now moot and that the independent claims are now allowable over the cited art, such that any of the remaining rejections and assertions made, particularly with respect to all of the dependent claims, do not need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice, and particularly with regard to the dependent claims.<sup>3</sup>

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; and/or (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

---

<sup>3</sup> Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting any official notice taken. Furthermore, although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Dated this 27<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Brian D. Tucker/

RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
BRIAN D. TUCKER  
Registration No. 61,550  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973

BDT:laf  
2179042\_1.DOC